

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Offic**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/485,381	05/27/98	YANNICK F. T.	15 20-1

1461707722

STEPHAN CLAUDE COOPER SWIFT
CRYSTAL PARK I II, SUITE 500B
2231 CRYSTAL DRIVE
ARLINGTON VA 22209

EXAMINER

PPANT, J.

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2711

5

DATE MAILED: 07/22/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/085,501	Applicant(s) MASSETTI
	Examiner Christopher Grant	Group Art Unit 2711

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher Grant

(3) _____

(2) Stephen Christopher Swift

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jul 21, 1999

Type: Telephonic Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement was reached. was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: None

Identification of prior art discussed:

none

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Informed applicant to submit a new abstract since the current abstract is not single spaced on a single page (with not more than 250 words) as per MPEP 608.01 (p). However, applicant's attorney informed the examiner that the abstract is correct and complies with the rules. The examiner reviewed MPEP 608.01 (p) and 37 CFR 1.72 to confirm the attorney's point of view. The examiner initially contended that the abstract is proper in accordance with the rules. However, upon a further review the examiner now contends that the abstract must be on a separate sheet (i.e. one sheet). The language from the two pages of the abstract have been joined together to form a single sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Chris Grant
CHRIS GRANT
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.